15712738300

;9496600809

13/ 16

Application No.: 10/664,671

Docket No.: JCLA12230

<u>REMARKS</u>

Present Status of the Application

The Office Action allowed claims 13-14, 19 and 25. Claims 11, 15-18 and 20-21 were

objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims

in the alternative only. Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), claims 1-6 were rejected as being anticipated by

Schadt et al. (US 4,452,718, hereafter as Schadt), claims 1-8 rejected as being anticipated by

CAPLUS 1989: 145504 (504'), and claims 1-6, 9, 11 and 22-24 rejected as being anticipated by

CAPLUS 2001: 180900 (900'). Claims 10 and 12 were objected to, in Point 6 of the Office Action,

as being dependent upon a rejected claim, while Applicants respectfully point out that claim 25

should not be included in Point 6 like claims 10 and 12 because claim 25 is an independent claim

and was allowed in Point 7 of the Office Action.

In response thereto, Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, 10, 11, 15-18 and 20-21 and

submitted the following remarks. Reconsideration of claims 1-12, 15-18 and 20-24 is respectfully

requested.

Discussion of Objections to Claims 11, 15-18 & 20-21

Please note that Applicants have amended claims 11, 15-18 and 20-21 such that each of

these claims refers to only one claim. Claim 10 has also been amended for the same reason.

Therefore, withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Page 12 of 15

Application No.: 10/664,671

Docket No.: JCLA12230

Discussions of Rejections to Claims 1-9, 11 & 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-6 were rejected as being anticipated by Schadt, claims 1-8 by 504', while claims 1-6, 9, 11 and 22-24 by 900'. Please note that independent claims 1 and 7 have been further amended, wherein the feature of "m+n+q \geq 1" newly added to claim 1 can be supported by paragraph [0040] and Examples in the specification that mention preferred embodiments of the compound each having at least one ring except A^4 .

Schadt, which was cited for rejecting claim 1 and claims 2-6 dependent therefrom, fails to disclose the feature of "m+n+q $\geq I$ " in amended claim 1. As indicated in Point 3 of the Office Action, the compound of "1-(trans-4-pentylcyclohexyl)-2-propen-1-one" in Scheme A in col. 7 of Schadt reads on the present formulae (1) and (1b) with m=n=q=0.

Another feature of amended claim 1 is that when m+n+q=1, Z^4 is a single bond and A^4 represents 1,4-phenylene, Z^1 , Z^2 and Z^3 each is <u>not</u> a single bond. Meanwhile, in claim 7, formulae (b)-(d) each satisfies the relationship of "m+n+q>1". For formula (a) with m+n+q=1 in amended claim 7, Z^4 is a single bond, while Z^1 is <u>not</u> a single bond when A^4 represents 1,4-phenylene.

The reference 504', which was cited for rejecting claims 1 and 7 and claims 2-6 and claim 8 respectively dependent therefrom, fails to disclose the above feature of amended claim 1 or 7. The compound of 1-(trans-4-pentylcyclohexyl)phenyl-2-propen-1-one (RN 119488-91-4) in 504' reads on the present formulae (1) and (1b) with m+n+q=1, Z^4 being a single bond, A^4 representing 1,4-phenylene and Z^1 , Z^2 and Z^3 each being a single bond.

Application No.: 10/664,671

Docket No.: JCLA12230

As for the reference 900' that was cited for rejecting claim 1, claims 2-6, 9 and 11 dependent from claim 1 and claims 22-24 dependent from claim 13, Examiner considered that the compound "CM1" in 900' corresponds to formula (2) in claim 13, and Applicants notice that Examiner wrote "R¹" under the group "-(CH2)8-O-C-C-M6" (hereafter as R900) of CM1. However, Applicants respectfully point out that R^{900} is not within the scope of R^{1} in claim 1 or 13: hydrogen, halogen, -CN, -CF3, -CF2H, -CFH2, -OCF3, -OCF2H, -N=C=O, -N=C=S, and, particularly, alkyl with 1-20 carbon atoms in which any -CH2-may be substituted with -O-, -S-, -CO-, -COO-, -OCO-, -CH=CH-, -CF=CF- or -C=C- and any hydrogen may be substituted with halogen or -CN. There is no way to obtain the moiety of $-C^{H2}_{C-M6}$ in C^{H2}_{C-M6} in C^{H2}_{C-M6} in C^{H2}_{C-M6} of a straight or branched alkyl with -CH=CH-, because there must be at least one H-atom on each of the two carbon atoms forming the double bond after the replacement is made.

The reference 900' also fails to disclose the newly added feature of "m=n=q≥1" of amended claim 1, because the compound "CM1" is under the condition of "m=n=q=0".

Accordingly, the compound "CM1" in 900' is not within the scope of the present formula (1) in independent claim 1, and the corresponding polymer unit from the compound "CM1" is not within the scope of formula (2) in independent claim 13.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 7 and 13 patently define over the prior art.

Application No.: 10/664,671

Docket No.: JCLA12230

For at least the same reasons mentioned above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-6, 9 and 11 dependent from claim 1, claim 8 dependent from claim 7 as well as claims 22-24 dependent from claim 13 all patently define over the prior art.

Discussions of Objections to Claims 10 & 12

Claims 10 and 12 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim 1. Since amended claim 1 patently defines over the prior art for at least the above reasons, withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 1-12, 15-18 and 20-24 are in proper condition for allowance like claims 13-14, 19 and 25 are. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date: 6/6/2006

4 Venture, Suite 250 Irvine, CA 92618

Fax: (949)-660-0809

Tel.: (949) 660-0761

Respectfully submitted, J.C. PATENTS

Jiawei Huang

Registration No. 43,330